

**Woodburn 5th Street Improvements Project
Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting #3
February 18, 2010**

Committee Members present

Cindy Wurdinger-Kelly
Linda Wilmes-Smith
Ed Krupicka
Christine Vistica
Tom Welch
Jaime Estrada
Dave Christoff

Peppi Kosikowski
Robert Carney
Casey Robles
Paul Iverson
Laura E. Isiordia
Shawn Baird

Committee Members absent

Tom Lonerger
Mario Magana
Caroline Sanchez-Ruiz
Jerry Ambris
Jessy Olsen
Myrna Wagner
Barbara Jean Burt

Staff

Dan Brown, *City of Woodburn Public Works Director*
Eric Liljequist, *City of Woodburn*
Kevin Thelin, *Murray, Smith & Associates*
Gabe Crop, *Murray, Smith & Associates*
Duane Barrick, *City of Woodburn*
Marta Corrilio, *City of Woodburn*
Eryn Deeming Kehe, *JLA Public Involvement*
Sam Beresky, *JLA Public Involvement*

Five members of the public attended this meeting.

Welcome and Introductions

Eryn Deeming Kehe welcomed the group, reviewed the binder materials, meeting logistics, agenda and reminded the group about the comment response log. Eryn mentioned that the comment log is meant to be a register of comments the project team has heard throughout the project. She said that comments can be emailed directly to Eric Liljequist at the City of Woodburn at eric.liljequist@ci.woodburn.or.us or by phone by calling 503-982-5241.

The overall purpose of the meeting was to present traffic information, to understand and provide feedback on couplet options and to introduce the Key Design Factors worksheet.

The CAC approved the Meeting #2 Summary.

CAC Member Robert Carney gave a short presentation to the group. He mentioned that he gave a short presentation to the Tukwila Neighborhood Association. He gave a brief overview of the location of the Tukwila Neighborhood in relation to the project area and reviewed the concerns expressed by the people who attended this recent meeting of the Association. He said there were many concerns with the potential of extra traffic through the Tukwila Neighborhood by people that will want to avoid congestion. He said that citizens were not necessarily opposed to the project as they see a benefit of a new stoplight at 5th but are concerned about the potential of increased traffic through their neighborhood as a way to avoid congestion on 214 or Boones Ferry.

Yew Street Options (*CAC and Public Questions appear in italics*)

Eric reviewed a memo sent to CAC members that outlined the City's desire to eliminate Yew Street options 1, 3 and 4. He mentioned that all three of those options have more property impacts and higher project costs.

What is the budget for the project?

Dan Brown responded and said that the City had allocated money that will cover the project design and some property costs. The City has a responsibility to finish the project with the least amount of cost possible. Options 1, 3 and 4 were all more expensive than Option 2 and did not provide any significant benefit over Option 2. Currently the projected cost is estimated at about twice the original estimates. The Woodburn City Council will have to budget for this project. He said that 45% (\$1.3 Million available) of the project will be paid for with System Development Charges.

There were CAC concerns with where the 55% costs of the project will come from that will not come from SDCs.

Dan responded that he will need to look further into the availability of funding to better address this concern.

Eryn asked the group to vote on the elimination of the Yew Street Options 1, 3 and 4. She let the committee know that they are not voting for a single option for final approval but by eliminating Yew Street Options 1, 3 and 4, the CAC are voting on setting a direction.

There was one Yellow Card and the rest Green, voting to eliminate Yew Street Options 1, 3 and 4.

CAC member Casey Robles had concerns with property acquisition and will not support any option that requires a forced sale of property.

CAC member Cindy Wurdinger-Kelly had the only yellow card. She felt that the City did not fully analyze the options. She felt that the Yew Street Option in general is okay but felt that the

City should have fully analyzed all of the options, in particular those that could connect to 1st in the future.

Traffic Information (*CAC and Public Questions appear in italics*)

Kevin gave a brief overview of the Traffic Flow Overview handout that was provided to the CAC. He also gave a brief overview of what a traffic model is. He mentioned that the project team did not receive the most recent numbers from the ODOT model until the evening before the meeting so they have not had time to fully analyze the data but felt that the traffic numbers presented to the CAC in the Traffic Flow Overview Figure based on engineering judgment were roughly 75% to 80% accurate.

There was some general discussion between the CAC and the project team about the traffic numbers presented and what they meant. Kevin mentioned that the numbers represented the Average Daily Traffic over a 24-hour period but that Woodburn uses peak hour traffic numbers to design for capital improvements. He also said that event traffic is also a critical element to look at but that infrastructure is not usually built to accommodate for event traffic, as it would be too expensive and not practical.

It is a reasonable assumption that the majority of new traffic through the project area will be peak hour traffic.

Are the numbers shown in the near or distant future?

The numbers shown are within months after the completed project but are assuming 2009 behaviors. ODOT has completed a model for 2035. That model shows that as infrastructure improves over time, there will be less pressure for people to seek alternate routes, or routes that cut through neighborhoods to avoid congestion on state highway bottlenecks.

It was stated that the purpose of the project was to relieve traffic congestion on Settlemier but the numbers show that there is little to no improvement. Is the project being completed for only 500 cars a day?

Roughly 25% of the traffic using the opened 5th Street will be from within the immediate area, about 35% will be from north of 214 and the majority of the potential 500 fewer cars along Settlemier will be during peak hour which would have significant impact.

The estimated guess is good but it also seems that if the 5th Street project is not completed that the numbers along Settlemier would be greatly increased.

The CAC requested a list of streets in Woodburn that have similar traffic numbers to the potential numbers for an opened 5th Street so they could get a first hand idea of what their street might be like.

Houses are closer to the streets on 5th than on other busy streets like Harrison.

The St. Luke's families use 5th Street 400 times a day, a couplet will make the pick up and drop off flow better.

Key Design Factors (*CAC and Public Questions appear in italics*)

Kevin reviewed the results (hand out) of the key design factors voting from the last CAC meeting. He mentioned that some design factors could be seen as either good or bad depending on the perspective of the person voting.

It was requested that when the information is presented to the City Council that it would be presented the same way it was originally presented to the CAC (with no differentiation between the traffic congestion categories). It was also mentioned that, depending on your perspective, the first four categories could be congestion related (local traffic congestion, system-wide traffic congestion, vehicle access and emergency response access).

Eryn said that the exercise is a tool to help the CAC better understand the different options and to organize the CAC's thoughts. She explained the handout and asked for feedback from the CAC on the design factors. The worksheet is boiled down to simple options and leaves out more specific elements like the direction of a couplet or where stop signs should be placed. She said that the CAC members could fill out the form at the meeting or take it with them and return it at a later date. Dan Brown mentioned that part of the purpose was to help educate the CAC about the complexities of the project and part of the purpose was for the project team to learn what the important factors are for the CAC.

It was requested that the CAC be allowed to re-vote on their priorities as the process moves forward as members' perspectives change.

Kevin reviewed the major differences between a couplet and a 2-way 5th Street option and explained the differences of the options in relation to traffic congestion, vehicle access and parking.

The clockwise couplet introduces a left turn movement at Yew and 5th, which would automatically create traffic issues.

Are there currently any one-way streets in Woodburn?

There is a modified one-way street for truck traffic. Dan Brown mentioned that there is a strong aversion to one-way streets in Woodburn in general.

Is emergency vehicle access reduced in the one-way option?

CAC member Paul Iverson responded and said that he does not like one-way streets as they can potentially increase response times. Dan Brown mentioned that response times are important but should not be used solely to make a final decision. Response times of the different options compared to current response times should be analyzed. He also mentioned that, given enough room, most emergency responders could access the streets going against the flow of traffic if the emergency required it.

It should be noted that opening 5th Street is a major factor in improving response times.

Dan Brown let the group know that the City knows a couplet option will be more expensive and introducing one-way streets is more controversial in Woodburn but mentioned that there are also benefits to a couplet. In regards to private property impacts and perceived private property impacts, the couplet will impact properties for the Yew Street connection while the two-way 5th Street option will stay within the current ROW. That option could impact landscaping associated with the homes along 5th Street even though no property will be taken.

The project should improve property values. If the Front Street project is looked at as an example, parking, a new street, new curbs and new sidewalks improve property values and with improved appearance, people generally take better care of their property, further improving property values.

One CAC member felt that private property impacts also include the livability inside homes and the impacts of living on a busier street. It was mentioned that nobody wants cars driving by their home all day.

Dan Brown said that the city will consider the impact to property owners, even when the property in front of their house is actually publically owned.

Public Comment

A member of the public asked if delay is accounted for in the traffic model.

Kevin said that delay is not addressed in the raw traffic volume numbers from the model, but is evaluated during the traffic analysis process for intersections of concern. The traffic numbers along the local streets in the project area normally low enough that they do not cause much concern. Dan Brown mentioned that volume to capacity is how the traffic flow is more often communicated.

Wrap Up

Eryn thanked the group for attending and for their feedback. The CAC voted to attend a 5th meeting if needed, although the project design team will attempt to finish the process at the 4th meeting. Dan Brown said that he hoped to take the recommendations to City Council by April 1.

A CAC member expressed the need for the project team to ask for their opinions on the options, as the meeting format does not leave much room for opinions to be expressed.

The project team reminded the group that they can email or send concerns and opinions at any time to Eric.